

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/083,312	02/25/2002	David Kammer	PALM-3741.US.P	5496	
7550 WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Third Floor			EXAMINER		
			TRAN, TUAN A		
Two North Mar. San Jose, CA 95			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
,			2618		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/083,312 KAMMER ET AL. Office Action Summary

Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit				
		TUAN A. TRAN	2618				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ldress			
Period f	or Reply						
WHIC - Exte afte - If No - Faile Anv	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA resions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 (I) (I) (I) (I) (I) (I) (I) (I) (I) (I)	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,			
Status							
1)[2]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Ju	ly 2010					
		action is non-final.					
/—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under E						
D!	in a Cololina	•					
	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 13-24</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) 1-6 and 13-24 is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	alastian requirement					
ا ا(٥	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the I	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is ob-	ected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
/—	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Applicati	on No				
	Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National	Stage			
	application from the International Bureau						
*:	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachmer	nt(s)						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	(PTO-413)				
2) Noti	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Faper No(s)/Mail Da	otaet Assiloation				

3) Anformation Disclosure Statement(s) (FTO/SD/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ______. 6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2618

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
 - Claims 1-3, 13-15 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsson (6,697,638).

Regarding claim 13, Larsson discloses a computer system 160 capable of establishing Bluetooth communications with other portable computer system (handset) 140 (See fig. 1), comprising: a Bluetooth radio 162; inherently a processor coupled to the Bluetooth radio via bus and coupled to a memory including instructions that when executed implement a method of establishing Bluetooth connections between computer systems, the method comprising: in response to a request from a first handheld computer system (i.e. handset) to establish communication between the first handheld computer system and a second computer system (i.e. car kit), establishing a Bluetooth connection between the first handheld computer system (i.e. handset) and the second computer system (i.e. car kit) by sending a Bluetooth page message from the second computer system (i.e. response page message) to the first handheld computer system without need of a Bluetooth inquiry message, wherein the establishing bypasses a Bluetooth discovery process (See fig. 8 and col. 4 line 60 to col. 5 line 8). However, Larsson does not explicitly mention that the second computer system is handheld

Art Unit: 2618

computer system and the steps of: storing a plurality of Bluetooth device identification of the first handheld computer system (handset) on a memory resident list of a second handheld computer system and accessing the device identification of the first handheld computer system on the second handheld computer system upon receiving the request from the first handheld computer system. Since Larsson does suggest that the second computer system being configured to allow communications with only those devices that are on a predetermined allowed list (See col. 4 lines 25-40); therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Larsson such that the second computer system can only establish the Bluetooth connection with the first handheld computer system (i.e. by sending the response message) when the first handheld computer system is on its allowed list, for the advantage of protecting the user privacy as well as preventing unauthorized communications. Further, since Larsson does suggest such method can be applied to the handheld environment (i.e. handset and car kit), but not explicitly between a handheld computer system and another handheld computer system; therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to apply such method for handheld computer systems for the advantage of expanding the application to various types of communications systems.

Regarding claim 14, Larsson discloses as cited in claim 13. Larsson further discloses the device identification is automatically determined in a two-way communication between the first and second handheld computer systems prior to step of establishing the Bluetooth connection (See col. 6 lines 41-53).

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claim 15, Larsson discloses as cited in claim 13. Larsson further discloses the device identification is unknown to the second handheld computer system and is entered by a user of the second handheld computer system (See col. 6 lines 54-64).

Claims 1-3 and 19-21 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 13-15, as method.

> Claims 4-5, 16-17 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsson (6,697,638) in view of Phillipps (WO 02/09362).

Regarding claim 16, Larsson discloses as cited in claim 13. However, Larsson does not explicitly mention that the second handheld computer system is capable of displaying list of device identification for selection by a user to establish the Bluetooth connection. Since portable computer system capable of displaying list of Bluetooth device identifications for selection by a user to establish the Bluetooth connection is known in the art as shown by Phillipps (See fig. 3 and page 3 line 30 to page 4 line 2); therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Phillips in modifying the portable computer system as disclosed by Larsson for the advantage of allowing the user to view the device list and to manually select a device in interest for connection.

Regarding claim 17, Larsson and Phillips disclose as cited in claim 16. Larsson further discloses the representation of the device identification is a Bluetooth friendly name (See col. 6 lines 59-64).

Art Unit: 2618

Claims 4-5 and 22-23 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 16-17, as method.

> Claim 6, 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsson (6,697,638) in view of Johansson et al. (2002/0044549).

Regarding claim 18, Larsson discloses as cited in claim 13. However, Larsson does not mention the step of automatically beginning the Bluetooth discovery process in responsive to a failure of step c). Since Johansson teaches a method of forming efficient scatternet (See fig. 3), wherein Johansson suggests that the Inquiry process (Bluetooth discovery process) should be invoked by every node periodically in order to detect new node or adapt to new connectivity conditions due to mobility or obstacles (See page 5 [0070]) and one known reason for a failure of establishing Bluetooth connection is devices that are out of range; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept of Johansson for configuring the system, as disclosed by Larsson, to invoke the Inquiry process (or discovery process) in responsive to a failure of establishing Bluetooth connection for the advantage of adapting to new connectivity conditions as well as allowing the user of the device to look for other compatible or available devices for connection.

Claims 6 and 24 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 18, as method

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2618

Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TUAN A. TRAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7858. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10:00AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 7

Art Unit: 2618